

## REMARKS

In view of the final Action, claims 1, 3, and 6-8 have been canceled, and claims 5 and 9 have been amended in independent form. In the application, claim 5 and 9 are pending.

In paragraph 5 of the final Action, claims 5 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orime in view of Hasebe. However, claims 5 and 9 are patentable over the cited references, as explained below.

In the final Action, it was held that "Regarding claim 5, Orime does not explicitly disclose 'wherein said reporting E-mail includes a plurality of choices for re-informing methods ... choices comprising placing a call to a first telephone' however Hasebe teaches this as a Web browser which displays information and gives a plurality of choices for re-informing (paragraphs 37-45)."

In paragraphs 36-45 of Hasebe, the operation of WWW server 13E is explained. Namely, the information transmitting server 13 processes to send a message by e-mail to members through specific steps, and if no reply is returned to the server within a specific period, the members without reply can be listed at the server. The message can be periodically sent for the members without reply.

Although the message can be sent periodically to the members without reply in Hasebe, the Web browser does not give a plurality of choices for re-informing to the user or requester of the service. No choice is provided by the Web browser to the requester or organizer. In this respect, the Examiner's opinion is not correct.

Also, it was held in paragraph 5 of the final Action that "Orime does disclose that management of a meeting was previously done by telephone (paragraph 3-4), and in the current system of Orime, the telephone number of an invitee is available (paragraph 20)."

As stated by the Examiner, a meeting was previously informed by telephone, and Fig. 8 of Orime discloses a table 8 showing address information of the attendants including address ID, group ID, name, address, telephone number, and so on. However, the table 8 simply suggests that the information of the attendant includes the telephone number and other invention.

In claim 5, it is specified that the reporting E-mail includes a plurality of choices for re-informing methods to the informed persons, said plurality of choices comprising placing a call to a first telephone number of informed persons having not responded, and placing a call to a second telephone number of said informed persons having not responded.

Orime discloses the table of attendants showing the telephone number, but Orime does not send the E-mail from the browser showing the telephone number of the attendant without response together with the list thereof. In Hasebe, although the message can be sent periodically to the members without reply, the Web browser does not give a plurality of choices for re-informing to the user or requester of the service.

Accordingly, even if Orime and Hasebe are referred to, claim 5 is not obvious from Orime and Hasebe.

Claim 9 includes, in addition to the basic system, means for preparing a list of informed persons not having checked a transmitted message, and means for periodically reporting the list to the informing person.

Namely, in claim 9, the list of informed persons not having checked a transmitted message is prepared, and the list is periodically sent to the informing person.


In Hasebe, it is disclosed that the resenting an invitation if the member does not response. However, it is not disclosed or suggested that the list of unattended persons is periodically sent

to the organizer or informing person. Orime does not disclose or suggest the list of unattended persons.

Therefore, even if Orime and Hasebe are referred to, claim 9 is not obvious from Orime and Hasebe.

Claims 5 and 9 pending in the application are patentable  
Reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

By   
Manabu Kanesaka  
Reg. No. 31,467  
Agent for Applicants

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 310  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 519-9785